

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for acknowledging acceptance of the drawings filed with the present application.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over ASANO et al. (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0185236) in view of DONAHUE et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,020,720). Applicants traverse the outstanding rejection.

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-26 will have been amended. The amendments to claims 1-26 should not be considered an indication of Applicants' acquiescence as the propriety of the outstanding rejection. Rather, Applicants have amended claims 1-26 to advance prosecution and to obtain early allowance of the claims in the present application.

The Office Action acknowledged that ASANO does not teach or suggest A) providing a first IP address to the subscriber device, the first IP address being associated with the first IP network; B) providing a second IP address to the subscriber device based on a request routed through the first IP network from the subscriber device, the second IP address being associated with the second IP network; or C) addressing data packets from the subscriber's device with the first IP address and the second IP address.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, forwarding a data packet addressed with both the first IP address and the second IP address, from the subscriber device. In contrast, ASANO is directed to a translation table for storing a correlation between the home address of a mobile IPv6 terminal and a virtual IPv4 address. In particular, ASANO teaches a translation apparatus that replaces the source address of a

packet transmitted by the mobile IPv6 terminal with a virtual IPv4 address. ASANO does not teach or suggest a data packet addressed with both the first IP address and the second IP address.

The Office Action relied upon DONAHUE as teaching the features which were acknowledged to be absent in ASANO. In this regard, DONAHUE is directed to bypassing a gateway's network address translation functionality using a publicly routable IP address assigned to a host on a private network as a bypass IP address. More particularly, DONAHUE refers to a (second, publicly routable) IP address assigned to the host on the private network as a bypass IP address (i.e., to bypass the gateway's network address translation functionality). DONAHUE indicates that this bypass IP address is used to bypass the gateway's network address translation functionality (see *e.g.*, column 6, lines 7-10 of DONAHUE). That is to say, an external device sending packets to a host on a private network need only address the host by the bypass IP address. Accordingly, DONAHUE merely teaches the use of a single bypass IP address by which inbound communications can be routed directly to the host on the private network (see *e.g.*, column 6, lines 13-15 of DONAHUE).

As set forth above, neither ASANO or DONAHUE teach or suggest a data packet addressed with both the first IP address and the second IP address. Indeed, DONAHUE teaches away from forwarding a data packet addressed with both the first IP address and the second IP address, as recited in amended claim 1, in that the host is assigned a public IP address (bypass IP address) so as to avoid the network address translation functionality required for the private IP address. Addressing a packet from the host with both a public and private address would render the public IP address (bypass IP address) superfluous.

The Office Action also relied upon DONAHUE as teaching, *inter alia*, providing a second IP address to the subscriber device based on a request routed through the first IP network from the subscriber device. However, the cited portions of DONAHUE at column 3, lines 32-54 and column 5, line 30 through column 6, line 35 do not teach or suggest providing a second IP address to the subscriber device based on a request, let alone providing a second IP address to the subscriber device based on a request routed through the first IP network from the subscriber device, or the second IP address being associated with a second IP network.

As set forth above, even modification of ASANO with the applied teachings of DONAHUE would not result in the above-noted features of claim 1. That is, ASANO is directed to a translation table that replaces the source address of a packet transmitted by the Mobile IPv6 terminal with a virtual IPv4 address. DONAHUE is directed to provided a host with a public IP address such that the functionality of a network address translation table (as in ASANO) can be bypassed. Accordingly, modification of ASANO with teachings of DONAHUE would not result in the combination of claim 1.

Claim 1 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over ASANO in view of DONAHUE, at least for each of the reasons set forth above. Independent claim 8 is allowable for reasons similar to the above-noted reasons for the allowability of claim 8.

Independent claim 18 is allowable for reasons similar to the above-noted reasons for the allowability of claim 1 in addition to reasons related to its own recitation. For example, neither ASANO nor DONAHUE teach or suggest that the originating device forwards data packets with both the first subscriber IP address and the second subscriber IP address, as recited in amended claim 18.

Claims 2-7, 9-17 and 19-26 are each allowable at least for depending, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 8 and 18, respectively, which Applicants have shown to be allowable, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is respectfully requested.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attached thereto.

Should an extension of time be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application, including any extensions of time required to place the application in condition for allowance by an Examiner's Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this Response or the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Keith ALLEN et al.

Joshua M. Povsner  
Reg. #42,086



Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

November 27, 2007  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191